## **REMARKS**

The Examiner rejected claims 32 – 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lentino. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Lentino discloses a reciprocating saw, not a tubeforming device. The saw in Lentino includes a blade holder, which may be construed to comprise a tool holder. However, Lentino does not dislose "a workpiece holder to receive a tubular workpiece," "a tool insertable into the an end of the tubular workpiece held by the work piece holder," or "a rotating cam assembly to drive the tool holder in first and second directions." As such, Lentino fails to anticipate any of claims 32 - 40.

The Examiner has also rejected independent claims 1, 15 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Belzil in view of Platt. Belzil discloses a device for forming notches in the end of a tube. However, in Belzil, the tool holder is pivoted and driven in different directions by hydraulic cylinders. Belzil does not disclose a rotating cam assembly. Platt discloses a machine for making cans. Platt does not appear at all relevant to the claimed invention and appears to have been selected by the Examiner simply because the machine has a cam for reciprocating a ram. The Examiner has not pointed to any motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of Belzil and Platt, other than the Examiner's own conclusory statement, which is not supported by any evidence of record. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 30 and 31 have been amended to correct the informality under 35 USC §112 noted by the Examiner.

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all pending claims 1-40.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.

Dated: January 19, 2006

David E. Bennett

Registration No.: 32,194

P.O. Box 5

Raleigh, NC 27602

Telephone: (919) 854-1844 Facsimile: (919) 854-2084